



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

II. — *The Death of Alcibiades.*

BY PROF. BERNADOTTE PERRIN,

YALE UNIVERSITY.

ACCORDING to the unimpeachable testimony of Xenophon (*Hell.* ii, 1, 25 f.), Alcibiades tried loyally, but in vain, to avert the disaster of Aigos Potamoi. This is the last well-attested fact in the career of Alcibiades, for, with the complete triumph of his greatest enemy, Lysander, in the fall of Athens and the accession to power there of the Thirty Tyrants, not only Athens, but all Hellas became unsafe for him,<sup>1</sup> and he betook himself, like Themistocles before him, to a Persian satrapy in Asia Minor, that of Pharnabazus, whom he had often thwarted and defeated. Thence he soon disappeared forever from among men, and such is the uncertainty of our tradition that we cannot say exactly why or how he disappeared.

Owing to the intricate political relations of the time, his death would have been welcomed by every party to those relations, excepting possibly King Artaxerxes himself. The Thirty had banished him from Hellas, but feared his hold upon the sympathies and confidence of his fellow exiles; the Thracians in Europe, whom he had harried and plundered, were deadly foes, and their brethren of Lesser Phrygia had no reason to welcome him; the Spartans looked upon him as the only possible restorer of the fallen Athenian democracy, to say nothing of the relentless personal hatred felt toward him by King Agis for the corruption of Queen Timaea; and the Persian satraps, — Pharnabazus, Tissaphernes, and Cyrus the Younger, — had good reason to fear his extraordinary acquaintance with their relations to one another and to the Great King, particularly if he succeeded in getting the ear of the King. Alcibiades was secretly murdered, and in the various strata of our traditions of his death we find the deed ascribed

<sup>1</sup> Isocrates, xvi, 40: οὐ τὸ τελευταῖον ἐπειδὴ κατέστησαν οἱ τριάκονθ' οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι τὴν πόλιν ἔφευγον, ἐκεῖνος δ' ἐξ ἀπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐξέπεσεν;

directly to the Thirty;<sup>1</sup> to the natives of Phrygia whom he had outraged (Plutarch, *Alc.* xxxix, 5); to the Spartans and Lysander;<sup>2</sup> to Pharnabazus wishing to please the Spartans (Diodorus, xiv, 11, 1), or at the behest of Lysander (Nepos, *Alc.* x, 3; Plut. *Alc.* xxxix, 1); and to Pharnabazus on his own account (Ephorus, cited in Diod. xiv, 11, 2 f.). In Plutarch, an appeal of the Thirty to Lysander is ineffectual until an order comes to him from the Ephors to put Alcibiades out of the way, whereupon he constrains Pharnabazus to do the deed, who deposes it to his brother and uncle, and they lead the band of murderers. This happily combines the hatred of Agis, the fear of the Spartan government and that of the Thirty, Lysander, and Pharnabazus, — in short, almost all the possible factors in the case, into one connected chain of causes. It is a good example, in an ancient authority, of the combination into one thread of various divergent threads of testimony. Each separate reason for the taking off of Alcibiades, excepting only that advanced by Ephorus, as well as a more or less cumulative grouping of them all, was natural and plausible inference on the part of ancient, as it is on the part of modern historians (see Judeich, *Kleinasiatische Studien*, p. 32 f.). Such natural and plausible inference differs widely from invention to supply lacking detail.

In the much more varied and romantic traditions about the manner of Alcibiades' taking off, invention has plainly been busy. No one but the perpetrators of the murder knew where or how it was committed, and the nature of the deed was such — a treacherous assassination — that the leading

<sup>1</sup> Justin, v, 8, 12 f.: *Caedes deinde civium ab Alcibiade auspicantur, ne iterum rem publicam sub obtentu liberationis invaderet. Quem cum profectum ad Artaxerxen Persarum regem conperissent, citato itinere miserunt qui eum intercepterent; a quibus occupatus, etc.*

This may, of course, be regarded as a corruption of the ordinary tradition that the murderers of Alcibiades were emissaries of Pharnabazus; but it reads like an independent version.

<sup>2</sup> Isocrates, xvi, 40 (continuing the above citation): *οὐ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ Λύσανδρος ὁμοίως ἔργον ἐποιήσαντ' ἐκείνον ἀποκτείνει καὶ τὴν ὑμετέραν καταλῦσαι δύναμιν, οὐδεμίαν ἡγούμενοι πῶσιν ἔξειν παρὰ τῆς πόλεως, εἰ τὰ τεῖχη καταβάλλοιεν, εἰ μὴ καὶ τὸν ἀναστῆναι δυνάμενον ἀπολέσειαν;* Of course, this does not necessarily shut out the mediation of Pharnabazus.

actors in it would take pains rather to conceal than to make known the facts. And though the murderers may have been many, the victim, in all probability, was alone. There is, at least, no conceivable reason why any attendants whom Alcibiades may have had with him should have been allowed to escape. Beyond the fact that Alcibiades had been put out of the way of his innumerable enemies, probably little found its way into the stories of his career for many years; and then, after that career had, for peculiar reasons, become one of surpassing interest, in the absence of authentic details of his death, romantic details were more or less freely invented.

We have an oration by Isocrates (xvi, *de Bigis*), written in 397 for the younger Alcibiades, and one by Lysias against the same (xiv), written in 395, nearly a decade after the death of the elder Alcibiades. "Denunciations of the father fill about one-half of the speech against the son, and the son devotes more than three-quarters of his address to a defence of his father" (Jebb). Ivo Bruns has shown (*Literarisches Porträt*, pp. 493-521) that these orations are, respectively, elaborate encomium on, and invective against, the elder Alcibiades, with a literary setting of legal procedure, and that the encomium of Isocrates bears witness to a strong reaction in favor of the memory of Alcibiades and against the bitter hatred felt toward it in the earlier years of the restored democracy. Thucydides had already voiced, if not initiated, this reaction, in his portraiture of Alcibiades. To both orators, Isocrates and Lysias, with opposite sympathies and aims, many of the details which were told in the Alexandrian period, and afterward, about the death of Alcibiades would have been most welcome, and would certainly have been used had they been known. But the former confines himself to the most general terms in mentioning the fact of Alcibiades' death and the reasons for it (xvi, 40, cited above); while the latter, in his survey of the infamies of Alcibiades, stops abruptly with the ridiculous charge that he betrayed the Athenian fleet, at Aigos Potamoi, together with Adeimantus (xiv, 38). Had the later stories then been current to the effect that Alcibiades had made himself a favorite at the

court of Pharnabazus, and was seeking, like Themistocles, to secure the favor of the Great King himself, it is almost certain that both Isocrates and Lysias would have made capital out of them *pro* and *contra*. And with what avidity would Lysias have seized upon the story of the *hetaera* who performed the last rites for Alcibiades, had that story then been current, judging from the unutterable incest of which he accuses Alcibiades in the lost oration cited by Athenaeus (pp. 534 f., 574 e); or, if that oration be wrongly attributed to Lysias, from the veiled charges of the same unnatural crimes in xiv, 6. It is reasonably safe to assume that in 395, nine years after the death of Alcibiades, little was known at Athens about the circumstances of that death, beyond the general features adduced by Isocrates: Alcibiades had fallen a victim to the intrigues of the Lacedaemonians and Lysander.

At the time of the Macedonian supremacy, almost two generations of men later, when Ephorus and Theopompus wrote their *Hellenica*, the prevailing attitude toward the memory of Alcibiades was one of admiration for his great powers, rather than of detestation for his excesses and follies, as the reference to him by Demosthenes (*contra Meid.* 143-147) clearly shows. How prominent a figure he was in men's recollections of the great age of Athens, is shown by the fact that when Aristotle wishes to illustrate the individualizing procedure of history as opposed to the generalizing procedure of poetry, he selects the achievements and sufferings of Alcibiades (*Poet.* ix, 4). The long debate between the enemies and the friends of the memory of Alcibiades had ended with the triumph of his friends. But it is hardly to be expected that the pleaders on either side of the case would rest satisfied with the bare statement of the fact of his death in consequence of Lacedaemonian intrigue, which is all that was actually known in 395. Invention had been busy here, as well as in the catalogues of his misdeeds. The account of his death by Ephorus, distinctly preserved for us in citation by Diodorus (xiv, 11, 4), will represent the current belief of the time. In one unessential point Ephorus controverts the current belief, *viz.* in his over-ingenious and improbable

interpretation of the motives which prompted Pharnabazus to send his murderers against Alcibiades. It was not, Ephorus declares, to please the Lacedaemonians, as was generally thought (see Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* V, p. 26, note), but, in his own interests, to prevent Alcibiades from forestalling him in bringing the schemes of Cyrus to the notice of the King. The emissaries of Pharnabazus, Ephorus goes on to say, found him encamped (on his journey to the satrap of Paphlagonia (!)) in a certain village of Phrygia, and surrounded his tent in the night with a mass of firewood. When this had been lighted and was in a great blaze, Alcibiades attempted to defend himself, but was overwhelmed by the fire and the darts shot at him by his enemies, and so perished.<sup>1</sup>

Here are more or less explicit details: Alcibiades, on a journey, was encamped for the night in a village of Phrygia, when his tent was surrounded with firewood, the wood set on fire, and Alcibiades was shot down and perished in the flames. He was consumed away from the earth. Whether this is authentic history or invention, — inferential invention to account for the really mysterious disappearance of Alcibiades, cannot be positively decided. But the presumption is against its being true history. The account first appears two generations of men later than the events described, after a period of hot partisan discussion of the relative merits and demerits of Alcibiades, during which invention and falsehood were rife, and in an author who seldom adds details of authentic history to the accounts of the authors whom he paraphrases — Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. From chap. xxvii of Plutarch's *Alcibiades*, to chap. xxxvii, 3, where the primary authority is Xenophon, much invented detail and rhetorical amplification is seen to have come from Ephorus and Theopompus, but not a single item of trustworthy additional history. About the death of Alcibiades, Xenophon is silent, and the encomium and denunciation of Alcibiades by Iso-

<sup>1</sup> Τοὺς δὲ (the emissaries of Pharnabazus) καταλαβόντας τῆς Φρυγίας ἐν τινὶ κώμῃ κατεσκευασκότα νυκτὸς περιθεῖναι ξύλων πλῆθος· ἀναφθέντος οὖν πολλοῦ πυρὸς τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην ἐπιχειρήσαι μὲν ἀμύνεσθαι, κρατηθέντα δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀκοντιζόντων τελευτῆσαι.

crates and Lysias respectively, published a decade after his death, present nothing more than the general fact of his disappearance in consequence of Spartan intrigue. It is unlikely that Ephorus or any other historian can here supply anything authentic to fill the gap. With such a great national achievement as Cimon's victories at the Eurymedon, the case is quite different. Here the skeleton account of Thucydides (i, 100, 1) can be filled out with authentic detail from Callisthenes (Plut. *Cimon*, xii, xiii), who doubtless found trustworthy material for his consistent and credible account of the battles not only in the *Atthis* of Hellanicus, but also in oral tradition from actual participants in the battles, at Athens and among the allies (Meyer, *Forsch.*, II, p. 7). No such possibility can be shown for Ephorus or Theopompus in the matter of the death of Alcibiades. This was a secret assassination, where there was every reason for concealing rather than for publishing the facts. However, be it history or inferential fiction, the account of the manner of Alcibiades' death given by Ephorus became fixed in subsequent tradition, as much else in his history became canonical which is indisputably fiction. It reappears in Pompeius Trogus, an "auctor e severissimis" of the Augustan age, whom Justin (v. 8) epitomizes thus: a quibus (the emissaries of the Thirty) occupatus, cum occidi aperte non posset, vivus in cubiculo, in quo dormiebat, crematus est.

But between the time of Ephorus and that of Pompeius Trogus, a mass of invented detail had accumulated around this Ephorean nucleus. Alcibiades became a favorite theme for biography, as he had been for rhetoric and dramatic dialogue, and where appropriate or telling incident in the exit from the scene of so tremendous a personality was wanting, it was freely and effectively supplied. Nepos, not so "severe" an author as Pompeius Trogus, gives us, in his account of the death of Alcibiades (chaps. ix, x), an elaborate amplification of the simple Ephorean nucleus. It is a composite of Theopompus, the rival of Ephorus; perhaps of Timaeus of Tauromenium, who flourished more than a century later than Theopompus; and, doubtless, of stock Alexandrian

biography through which the version of Theopompus comes down to Nepos.<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note the accretions both to the causes assigned for the death of Alcibiades, and to the circumstances of it. We are told of adventures of Alcibiades on his journey from Pactye, in the Thracian Chersonnesus, through the hostile Thracians north of the Propontis to Pharnabazus in Asia. In the nature of the case, no genuine tradition of these could exist, and Plutarch (*Alc.* xxxvi, 3 f.) gives a quite different version of them. The Themistoclean analogy induces the plausible fiction of the fugitive's favorable reception at the court of Pharnabazus, and the bestowal upon him by that satrap of "Grynium, in Phrygia castrum, ex quo quinquaginta talenta vectigalis capiebat," — a dubious city with an impossible revenue. It is intrinsically improbable that Pharnabazus, with the experiences of Tissaphernes before his eyes, would allow himself to become the tool of Alcibiades, and entirely contrary to his otherwise straightforward and soldierly character that he should treacherously murder one whom he had lulled into security by extravagant favors. Pharnabazus was no Tissaphernes.

Alcibiades, the tradition of Theopompus goes on to relate, learns of the plotting of Cyrus against the Great King, and asks from Pharnabazus an escort up to the royal court, that he may make use of his knowledge there to win the favor of the King. But the Thirty at Athens warn Lysander in Asia that Alcibiades must be put out of the way if Lysander's work at Athens is to endure, and Lysander therefore demands Alcibiades from Pharnabazus, dead or alive. The satrap chose to violate his hospitality rather than to alienate the Spartans from the King, and sent Susamithres and Bagaeus to kill Alcibiades in Phrygia, where he was preparing his journey to the King. Coming secretly to the place where Alcibiades was, they took measures to kill him. They dared

<sup>1</sup> *Alc.* xi, 1 f.: Hunc infamatum a plerisque tres gravissimi historici summis laudibus extulerunt; Thucydides, qui eiusdem aetatis fuit, Theopompus, post aliquanto natus, et Timaeus; qui quidem duo maledicentissimi nescio quo modo in illo uno laudando conspirant. Namque ea, quae supra scripsimus, de eo praedicarunt.



not attack him with ordinary weapons, and so by night they heaped firewood around the house where he was sleeping, and set it on fire, in order to kill with the flames one whom they despaired of overwhelming by force. Alcibiades, roused by the flames, although his sword had been removed from him (by stealth?), snatched a dagger from a faithful Arcadian friend whom he had with him, and who had vowed never to leave him. This man he bade follow him, and then snatching up what clothing there was at hand, threw it upon the flames, and so passed safely through them. When the barbarians saw that he had escaped the fire, they hurled their weapons at him from afar, slew him, and brought his head to Pharnabazus. But a woman, who was accustomed to live with him, wrapped his dead and headless body in her woman's garments, and burned it in the flames of the house where his enemies had planned to burn him alive (*Nepos, Alc. ix, x*).

It is not difficult to suggest a probable genesis for most of the details not already found in the tradition of Ephorus. The names of the emissaries of Pharnabazus are orthodox Persian names, given in slightly different form by Plutarch, and added to the story for the sake of greater verisimilitude, — a common device of romantic tradition. In the tradition of Plutarch, for the sake of still greater verisimilitude, "Magaëus" and "Susamithras" are respectively brother and uncle of Pharnabazus (*xxxix, 1*). The scene of the tragedy is a village in Phrygia, a natural and plausible assumption, since Lesser Phrygia was part of the domain of Pharnabazus.<sup>1</sup> So brave a man as Alcibiades notoriously was, whose statue, if we may trust the elder Pliny (*N.H. xxxiv, 12*) and Plutarch (*Numa, viii*), had stood in the Roman comitium from the time of the Samnite wars down to that of Sulla, to represent the

<sup>1</sup> Under Roman rule in Asia Minor, Lesser Phrygia, as a separate territorial division, disappeared; and therefore when Hadrian wished to erect a monument for Alcibiades, the traditions of his death had fixed themselves upon a village of Greater Phrygia, which, at the time of Alcibiades' death, had been part of the domain of Cyrus. *Εἶδομεν δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ ἐν Μελίσσῃ τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου μνήμα ἐκ Συννάδων εἰς Μητρόπολιν ἀφικνούμενοι· ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ κατ' ἔτος θύεται βοῦς, διακελευσάμενον τοῦτο τοῦ πάντα ἀρίστου Ἀδριανοῦ βασιλέως· ὃς καὶ ἀνέστησεν ἐπὶ τῷ μνήματι Παρίου λίθου εἰκόνα τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην* (*Ath. p. 574 f.*).

bravest of the Hellenes, could not be allowed to perish ingloriously in a fiery trap. Witness to his valor, with the same effort at verisimilitude which supplied the Persian names of the deputies of Pharnabazus, had been furnished, in one version, by a faithful Arcadian friend, unnamed, about whom nothing else is ever heard; and, in another version, by a *hetaera*, without one or two of whom, as his enemies averred (*Ath.* p. 574 e), Alcibiades never travelled. In the tradition of Nepos, both witnesses are united; in that of Plutarch the *hetaera* alone suffices, and her name is not Theodoté, as ordinarily given, but, since only a famous *hetaera* would answer for so famous a man, Timandra, the mother of Lais the Corinthian (*Alc.* xxxix, 4). But whether it be established by the mouth of one or of two witnesses, Alcibiades escaped the flames and died from the weapons of his enemies, as a great warrior should. In the tradition of Nepos a touch of oriental savagery is given by having the head of Alcibiades brought to Pharnabazus for Lysander, but his headless body is consumed in the blazing cabin, as the earlier tradition had it consumed without decapitation, without any friendly intent, and without any merciful mitigation of the horror.

More than a century after Nepos, Plutarch gave his artistic version of events at the close of Alcibiades' career, following in the main the tradition of Theopompus rather than that of Ephorus. Certain deviations and additions peculiar to Plutarch, in so far as they have not been already noticed, may be briefly indicated here, before seeking to get the total effect of his narrative. We find in Plutarch a little more definiteness in the adventures of Alcibiades before reaching Pharnabazus. It is in Bithynia that the Thracians rob him, rather than "supra Propontidem." The analogy of Themistocles is used quite differently. It is at the court of Artaxerxes that Alcibiades wishes to revive the rôle of Themistocles, and to this end he courts successfully the favor of Pharnabazus. In Plutarch, Lysander is reluctant to meet the wishes of the Thirty, and only when the Ephors order him to "put Alcibiades out of the way," does he bid Pharnabazus to perform the deed. There is no ghastly oriental decapitation of the

victim in the main story of Plutarch, although in a curious way he shows his acquaintance with this grosser phase of the tradition. Instead of being on a journey to the King, Alcibiades was living in the Phrygian village with Timandra, and shortly before his death has a prophetic vision. Plutarch gives two versions of this vision, the second of which only is based on that form of the tradition which has Alcibiades beheaded and his body burned. The version which Plutarch adopts is conformed to that softened and pathetic account of the final disposition of Alcibiades' body which the gentle writer either constructed himself or selected from his sources. And the bravery of Alcibiades is much enhanced in Plutarch's story. There is no Arcadian attendant to assist the hero. Alone he scatters the barbarians who have set fire to his house, and alone he falls by their missiles. Timandra, whose escape from fire and missiles is not explained, wraps his body in her own woman's garments, and gives it such honorable burial as she can. Almost all the essential variations of his story from that of the tradition of Theopompus are such as one would expect in a writer of Plutarch's temperament and character, if he were allowing himself artistic freedom in the reproduction of the material of tradition.

This, then, is his complete story of the death of Alcibiades:—

“Alcibiades now feared the Lacedaemonians, who were supreme on land and sea, and betook himself into Bithynia, carrying much treasure with him, and securing much as he went, but leaving even more behind him in the fortress where he had been living. But in Bithynia he lost much of his substance, being plundered by the Thracians there, and so he determined to go up to the court of Artaxerxes. He thought to show himself no inferior to Themistocles when the King made trial of his services, and superior in his pretext for offering them. For it was not to be against his fellow-countrymen, as in the case of that great man, but in behalf of his country, that he would assist the King and beg him to furnish forces against a common enemy. Thinking that Pharnabazus could best give him facilities for making

this journey up to the King, he went to him in Phrygia, and continued there with him, paying him court and receiving marks of honor from him.

"The Athenians were greatly depressed at the loss of their supremacy. But when Lysander robbed them of their freedom too, and handed the city over to thirty men of his mind, then, their cause being lost, their eyes were opened to the course they should have taken when salvation was still in their power. They sorrowfully rehearsed all their mistakes and follies, the greatest of which they considered to be their second outburst of wrath at Alcibiades. He had been cast aside for no fault of his own; but they got angry because a subordinate of his lost a few ships disgracefully, and then they themselves, more disgracefully still, robbed the city of its ablest and most experienced general.

"And yet, in spite of their present plight, a vague hope still prevailed that the cause of Athens was not wholly lost so long as Alcibiades was alive. He had not, in times past, been satisfied to live his exile's life in idleness and quiet; nor now, if his means allowed, would he tolerate the insolence of the Lacedaemonians and the madness of the Thirty.

"It was not strange that the multitude indulged in such dreams, when even the Thirty were moved to anxious thought and inquiry, and made the greatest account of what Alcibiades was planning and doing. Finally, Critias tried to make it clear to Lysander that as long as Athens was a democracy the Lacedaemonians could not with safety have the rule in Hellas; and that Athens, even though she were very peacefully and well disposed towards oligarchy, would not be suffered, while Alcibiades was alive, to remain undisturbed in her present condition. However, Lysander was not persuaded by these arguments until an official message came from the authorities at home bidding him put Alcibiades out of the way; whether they too were alarmed at the vigor and enterprise of the man, or whether they were doing this as a favor to Agis.

"Accordingly, Lysander sent to Pharnabazus and bade him do this thing, and Pharnabazus commissioned Magaeus his

brother and Sousamithras his uncle to perform the deed. At that time Alcibiades was living in a certain village of Phrygia, where he had Timandra the courtesan with him, and in his sleep he had the following vision.

"He thought he had the courtesan's garments upon him, and that she was holding his head in her arms while she adorned his face like a woman's with paints and pigments. Others say that in his sleep he saw Magaeus cutting off his head and burning his body. All agree in saying that he had the vision not long before his death.

"The party sent to kill him did not dare to enter his house, but surrounded it and set it on fire. When Alcibiades was aware of this, he gathered together most of the garments and bedding in the house and cast them on the fire. Then, wrapping his cloak about his left arm, and drawing his sword with his right, he dashed out, unscathed by the fire, before the garments were in flames, and scattered the barbarians, who ran at the mere sight of him. Not a man stood ground against him or came to close quarters with him, but all held aloof and shot him with javelins and arrows.

"Thus he fell, and when the barbarians were gone, Timandra took up his dead body, covered and wrapped it in her own undergarments, and gave it such brilliant and honorable burial as she could provide.

"This Timandra, they say, was the mother of that Lais who was called the Corinthian, though she was a prisoner of war from Hyccara, a small city of Sicily. And some, while agreeing in all other details of Alcibiades' death with what I have written, say that it was not Pharnabazus who was the cause of it, nor Lysander, nor the Lacedaemonians, but Alcibiades himself. He had corrupted a girl of a certain well-known family, and had her with him; and it was the brothers of this girl who, taking his wanton insolence much to heart, set fire by night to the house where he was living, and shot him down, as has been described, when he dashed out through the fire."

This we must regard as romantic and beautiful historical fiction. The conscientious historian, in giving what he be-

lieves to be true history in the matter, cannot go much, if any, beyond what was known to Isocrates and Lysias: Alcibiades, soon after the accession of the Thirty to power in Athens, sought refuge from enemies whom he feared the more, with Pharnabazus, whom he feared the less, but was soon put out of the way by that satrap, in response to the demands of Sparta.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A good example of the old combination method in the treatment of cumulative tradition may be seen in Hertzberg's *Alcibiades* (1853), pp. 351-355; of the eclectic method, in Grote's treatment of the case, *Hist. of Greece*, VI (Engl. ed.), pp. 529-532 ("I put together what seems to me the most probable account of the death of Alcibiades from Plutarch, Diodorus, Cornelius Nepos, Justin, and Isokrates. There were evidently different stories, about the antecedent causes and circumstances, among which a selection must be made"). The severer attitude of a later school of historians toward the same evidence is well illustrated by the brevity of Eduard Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* V, p. 25 f. ("So gab er [Pharnabazus] der Forderung nach; er liess Alcibiades auf der Reise in Phrygien ueberfallen und niedermachen").